

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

DENICE MORGAN

Plaintiff

v.

Civil Action No.: 05-0967 (RMC)

MICHAEL L. DOMINGUEZ,
Secretary of the Air Force

Defendant.

**PLAINTIFF'S AMENDED CONSENT MOTION FOR ENLARGEMENT OF TIME
AND MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE COURT'S JANUARY 10, 2006 MINUTE ENTRY
ORDER**

Plaintiff, Denice Morgan, by and through undersigned counsel, respectfully moves this Court pursuant to Rule 6(b)(1), Fed. R. Civ. P., to enlarge the time to reply or otherwise respond to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or, in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment. Plaintiff requests that the deadline for responding be extended 30 days, specifically from September 28 to October 28, 2005. This is Plaintiff's first request for an enlargement of time in this case, and no scheduling order has been entered. Defendant, through counsel, graciously consented to this motion.

This enlargement of time is sought for the following reasons:

1. Counsel for Plaintiff has had and will have in the immediate future a series of trials and administrative hearings that have prevented completion of the opposition, including the nationally-publicized case involving the military working dog handlers at Abu Ghraib Prison in Baghdad., U.S. v. SGT Cardona. See Washington Post, January 12, 2006 at 1.
2. Counsel has a hearing in Stafford County District Court on January 17, 2006

(Scarborough v. Mary Washington Hospital), a trial in Alexandria Circuit Court on January 18, 2006 in Sommerville v. Safeway, Inc., an administrative appeal on January 20, 2006 (Theodore S. Kolbert, III/Secret Service), a deposition on January 23, 2006 (McLaughlin), and a hearing on January 26, 2006 (Cardona), a hearing in Fairfax Circuit Court on January 27, 2006 (Butenko, et al. v. Franklin).

3. In addition, Counsel for Plaintiff's father-in-law, who lives in Pittsburgh, suffered a heart-attack during the holidays. He has been assisting in making arrangements for his father-in-law to be transferred to an assisted living facility.

This extension is sought in good faith and will not unfairly prejudice any party. Allowing Plaintiff some additional time to formulate its response will aid both the parties and the Court in the development and resolution of this case. No further extensions will be sought.

WHEREFORE, based on the foregoing, Plaintiff respectfully requests that the time for answering or otherwise responding to Defendant's Motion to Dismiss, or, in the Alternative, for Summary Judgment be extended to February 1, 2006.

Dated: January 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

DENICE MORGAN
By Counsel

/S/

Harvey J. Volzer, DCB 263525
216 South Patrick Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 549-0446
(703) 549-0449 facsimile
Counsel for Plaintiff

_____/S/
Fred Goldberg, DCB 279893
7101 Wisconsin Avenue, Suite 1201
Bethesda, MD 20814
(301) 654-3300
(301) 654-1109
Counsel for Plaintiff

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that the foregoing Consent Motion for Enlargement of Time was served upon defendant pursuant to the Court's electronic filing system, addressed to:

Megan Rose
Assistant United States Attorney
Judiciary Center Building, E-4220
Civil Division
555 4th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20530

on this 12th day of January, 2006.

_____/S/
Harvey J. Volzer